

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| In re application of: |) | Attorney Docket No. 080743165002 |
| Heideman et al. |) | |
| |) | |
| Serial No.: 09/693,803 |) | |
| |) | |
| Filed: October 20, 2000 |) | |
| |) | |
| For: INTEGRATED OPTICAL |) | |
| LIGHTGUIDE DEVICE |) | |
| |) | |
| Examiner: Kang, Juliana |) | |
| |) | |
| Group Art Unit: 2874 |) | |
| |) | |
| Confirmation No.: 8677 |) | |

REMARKS

Claims 14, 15, 20, 24, and 26-36 are now in the application. Claims 1-13, 16-19, 21-23 and 25 have been cancelled.

Claims 14, 15, 20 and 24 were allowed, however these claims have been modified. Applicants believe these claims are still allowable, but they should be carefully reviewed by the Examiner to make sure she is satisfied.

The Examiner rejected several earlier submitted claims under section 102 based on Duveneck et al., (US 6,395,558) stating that the reference disclosed a non-constant grating. This is not functionally correct when viewed from the direction of light propagation. In FIG. 1 of Duveneck et al. a light beam traveling from left to right would experience a constant period grating. If the light beam moved laterally - into the plane of the paper, for example - that beam would also experience a constant period grating. The first constant period grating would, however, have a larger period than the second constant period grating. Duveneck's constantly varying grating is a device for replacing a series of gratings disposed side by side where each

grating has a constant period, but where the period of each succeeding grating has a period that is progressively reduced. Duveneck et al. does not teach a varying period in the direction of light propagation.

It is believed that the various objections and rejections under section 112 mentioned in the last Office Action have been obviated by the amended and new claims.

Favorable action is respectfully solicited.